

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 93 14:06:45 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #171
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 2 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 171

Today's Topics:

 Anti-ham legislation i (4 msgs)
 Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-((2 msgs)
 blind VEs
 Dealing with zoning laws?
 Important!: Field Day Packet Contacts can be disqualified!
 Unsubscrib

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1993 00:06:54 -0600
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!uum1!
kksys.com!edgar!tdkt!FredGate@dog.ee.lbl.gov
Subject: Anti-ham legislation i
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> I'll bet that in Minnesota if a policeman observes a piece of radio
> equipment in your vehicle, that is grounds for pulling you over,
> spreading you against the car like any other criminal, and searching
> your person and vehicle to see if they can find anything wrong.

Not quite. In Minnesota all you need is your Amateur Radio License and
you are all set. It is probably wise to NOT have the radio blaring
police calls when you are stopped though. :) Following is the
Minnesota State Law as it currently stands. The proposed new law never
made it and was dropped.

299C.37 Police communication equipment; use, sale

Subdivision 1. (a) No person other than peace officers within the state, the members of the state patrol, and persons who hold an amateur radio license issued by the Federal Communications Commission, shall equip any motor vehicle with any radio equipment or combination of equipment, capable of receiving any radio signal, message, or information from any police emergency frequency, or install, use or possess the equipment in a motor vehicle without permission from the superintendent of the bureau upon a form prescribed by the superintendent.

An amateur radio license holder is not entitled to exercise the privilege granted by this paragraph if the license holder has been convicted in this state or elsewhere of a crime of violence, as defined in section 624.712, subdivision 5, unless ten years have elapsed since the person has been restored to civil rights or the sentence has expired, whichever occurs first, and during that time the person has not been convicted of any other crime of violence.

For purposes of this section, "crime of violence" includes a crime in another state or jurisdiction that would have been a crime of violence if it had been committed in this state.

Radio equipment installed, used, or possessed as permitted by this paragraph must be under the direct control of the license holder wherever it is used.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c), any person who is convicted of a violation of this subdivision shall, upon conviction for the first offense, be guilty of a misdemeanor, and for the second and subsequent offenses shall be guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

(c) An amateur radio license holder who exercises the privilege granted by paragraph (a) shall carry the amateur radio license in the motor vehicle at all times and shall present the license to a peace officer on request. A violation of this paragraph is a petty misdemeanor. A second or subsequent violation is a misdemeanor.

Subd. 3. The superintendent of the bureau shall, upon written application, issue a written permit, which shall be nontransferable, to a person, firm, or corporation showing good cause to use radio equipment capable of receiving a police emergency frequency, as a necessity, in the lawful pursuit of a business, trade, or occupation.

Subd. 4. Repealed by Laws 1983, c. 293, & 115.

1987 Legislation

The 1987 amendment allowed the bureau of criminal apprehension to allow amateur radio operators to use equipment capable of receiving police emergency radio frequencies.

That should pretty well answer your questions. No need to bypass the state on your trips now! :)

73, John K0TG

Sysop HAM>link< RBBS John.Desmond@tdkt.kksys.com
or k0tg@amsat.org

* Origin: HAM>link< RBBS 612/HAM-0000 Saint Paul, MN [K0TG] (1:282/100)

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 18:33:22 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!

rsg1.er.usgs.gov!resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Anti-ham legislation i

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <738834109.AA01798@tdkt.kksys.com>, jdesmon@tdkt.kksys.com (John Desmond) writes:

|>

|> (c) An amateur radio license holder who exercises the privilege
|> granted by paragraph (a) shall carry the amateur radio license in the
|> motor vehicle at all times and shall present the license to a peace
|> officer on request. A violation of this paragraph is a petty
|> misdemeanor. A second or subsequent violation is a misdemeanor.

|>

|> 73, John K0TG

|> Sysop HAM>link< RBBS John.Desmond@tdkt.kksys.com
|> or k0tg@amsat.org

--

I will be taking my technician test on the 11th with reasonable certainty of passing. I will be travelling through Minnesota twice in the first week of July and plan on taking my new HT. I notice that Minnesota has been setting up "Narcotics Check Points" occasionally and appear to be pulling over cars at random. Should I be concerned about being "almost licensed" if my HT is tucked away in luggage? Would it be of any help to bring along any paperwork that shows I have passed and am only awaiting my license certificate? Thanks...

++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer

+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+

+++++

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 18:46:38 GMT
From: csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Anti-ham legislation i
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If it is illegal to possess a scanner in a motor vehicle without an amateur license then I bet an Amateur could really clean up by DELIVERING scanners to non-hams in the area. This shouldn't be breaking any regs since it isn't making money using the privs. authorized by the license. Another question, sorta serious, is that it could be considered probable cause for a police officer to pull you over. And police don't like to go through the trouble of making a pull over and then not writing a ticket. If you had amateur plates this problem would be alleviated.

Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: 2 Jun 93 14:32:50 CDT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!msuinfo!uchinews!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!
hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Anti-ham legislation i
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article AA01798@tdkt.kksys.com, jdesmon@tdkt.kksys.com (John Desmond) writes:
| (c) An amateur radio license holder who exercises the privilege
| granted by paragraph (a) shall carry the amateur radio license in the

|motor vehicle at all times and shall present the license to a peace
|officer on request. A violation of this paragraph is a petty
|misdemeanor. A second or subsequent violation is a misdemeanor.

Does the said law pertain to mobile radios commonly used by hams (not
just scanners?)

Is the implication that in Minnesota it is a misdemeanor to leave your
license home?

And do you have to remove the radio if you are going to let a non-ham
(say your wife) borrow your car?

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com
-Sourdough and Ham- NOWWN

Old Cowboys never die. They just smell that way!

Date: 2 Jun 1993 16:49:51 GMT
From: sun-barr!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!west.West.Sun.COM!l1-a!flloyd@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>In article <1uenii\$nmnm@thumper.cc.utexas.edu> davros@thumper.cc.utexas.edu (Buddy
Brannan) writes:

>>

>>The FCC has told a blind Advanced Class ham that he cannot administer VE
>>examinations because he's not able to "observe" the candidates, as per the
>>rules in Part 97 (this because of his blindness). Simple as that. His club
>>or whatever wouldn't let him help with their tests; he filed a discrimination'
>>complaint with the FCC, who took some time in reaching a decision. Their de-
>>cision was to say that the club was right in not letting this fella administer
>>exams.

>>

>>My personal view on this, as a blind Extra Class ham is that the FCC is wrong.
>>Blind people can (and have) given exams (both as teachers and professors,
>>to sighted students and I'm certain as VE') for quite some time now. They have
>>done so successfully, since these teachers are still employed ... The fact
>>that these blind people are blind has not hindered their ability to "observe"
>>their surroundings. This is probably one of the silliest (and stupidest and
>>lots of other things) thing I've heard from the FCC in some time.

>

I'm having trouble understanding why this is "Bad News" for the blind
hams. Yes, it is probably a personal setback for the blind ham in

question but I would imagine that a great many other things in life disappoint him as well. It's a fact of life that certain physical disabilities preclude certain activities. All handicapped people are aware of this, however, some refuse to accept it. And yes, there are a great many things that the handicapped can do, frequently better than able bodied people. On the other hand, there are some handicaps which no matter how determined or dedicated the person may be, simply cannot be overcome.

The VE program was not designed to be a goal that amateurs aspire to attain, it was designed to off-load work from the FCC, and to provide more opportunities for exams to be held. If the blind ham wants to become a VE solely for the purpose of enriching the hobby, there are countless alternative ways in which this can be done. The blind hams are not, in my opinion, being denied any significant opportunity to further the hobby or cause of amateur radio.

I would also add that the reference to blind university teachers has some merit but one must consider the circumstances under which they work and the environment in which they're in. Overall, a university is typically a much more serious and presumably ethically conscious setting than your average VE session. In the case of a VE exam, literally anyone from off the street can come in, and take the test for an amateur license. This contrasts greatly with the college student who is fully aware that being caught cheating could ruin their entire lifelong career. On the basis of value, an amateur radio license is worthless compared to a college degree. It's a completely different environment, and therefore invalid as a basis for comparison.

There are very good and valid reasons for the FCC to require that the VE "observe" the applicant (or "testee" if you will). There can be little doubt that countless numbers of individuals exist who would waste no time in exploiting the examiner's inability to observe them. It would be virtually the same as if one were to place applicants into a closed room, shut the door and wait for them to come out. With all of today's test questions being preselected, it becomes nothing less than trivial to bring notes or "cheat sheets" into the exam session. Such notes make no noise and are very inconspicuous to someone who can't see them. Granted, the many of the so-called "legally blind" could detect such behaviour, but the above complaint does not distinguish among them and furthermore, makes no effort to exclude the profoundly blind.

Turning one's head to such possibilities gives rise to a system which is based completely upon honor, something which the FCC has never successfully implemented. This can be witnessed by the requirement of a minimum of three VE's to conduct a session, as well as a host of other examples. If the FCC thought they could trust people, they would

just ask them to sign an affidavit attesting to the fact that they were qualified and would be the end of it.

Sorry, but it doesn't work that way in real life. If the blind hams want someone to blame for their loss of privilege, I would suggest that they look at their fellow man rather than the FCC. The requirement for "observation" is a direct response to the lack of uniform ethics among people in general. This trend is unlikely to change anytime soon.

-fred

[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ	Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM]
[Sun Microsystems,	Systems Engineer]
[Phoenix, AZ	(602) 224-3517]

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 17:38:27 GMT
From: csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE] (flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com) wrote:

: I'm having trouble understanding why this is "Bad News" for the blind
: hams. Yes, it is probably a personal setback for the blind ham in
The presumption is that this ruling would effect all blind amateurs and not
be applied in this single instance. That is why it is bad news for all
blind hams and not just this one individual.
: question but I would imagine that a great many other things in life
: disappoint him as well. It's a fact of life that certain physical
: disabilities preclude certain activities. All handicapped people are
: aware of this, however, some refuse to accept it. And yes, there are a
: great many things that the handicapped can do, frequently better than
: able bodied people. On the other hand, there are some handicaps which no
: matter how determined or dedicated the person may be, simply cannot be
: overcome.

You are correct that there are somethings that handicapped people are
unable to do. I believe that it should be left, as much as possible, for
the individual to decide what they are able to accomplish and not the FCC.

If they can show that the amateur is unable to discharge the duties of
being a VE then by all means disallow them from doing so.

: The VE program was not designed to be a goal that amateurs aspire to
: attain, it was designed to off-load work from the FCC, and to provide
: more opportunities for exams to be held. If the blind ham wants to
: become a VE solely for the purpose of enriching the hobby, there are

: countless alternative ways in which this can be done. The blind hams
: are not, in my opinion, being denied any significant opportunity to
: further the hobby or cause of amateur radio.

True but they are being denied the opportunity to further the hobby in the
manner they choose.

: I would also add that the reference to blind university teachers has
: some merit but one must consider the circumstances under which they
: work and the environment in which they're in. Overall, a university is
: typically a much more serious and presumably ethically conscious
: setting than your average VE session. In the case of a VE exam,
: literally anyone from off the street can come in, and take the test for
: an amateur license. This contrasts greatly with the college student
: who is fully aware that being caught cheating could ruin their entire
: lifelong career. On the basis of value, an amateur radio license is
: worthless compared to a college degree. It's a completely different
: environment, and therefore invalid as a basis for comparison.

I don't understand your point here Fred. A University degree is very
important and the University is full of kids from 18 to 22 years old, the
average age of amateur radio operators is 50+ and the license is a of
little significance to your success in life and obtaining a job etc.
Therefore you expect less cheating in a University.

: There are very good and valid reasons for the FCC to require that the
: VE "observe" the applicant (or "testee" if you will). There can be
: little doubt that countless numbers of individuals exist who would
: waste no time in exploiting the examiner's inability to observe them.
: It would be virtually the same as if one were to place applicants into
: a closed room, shut the door and wait for them to come out. With all
: of today's test questions being preselected, it becomes nothing less
: than trivial to bring notes or "cheat sheets" into the exam session.
: Such notes make no noise and are very inconspicuous to someone who
: can't see them. Granted, the many of the so-called "legally blind"
: could detect such behaviour, but the above complaint does not
: distinguish among them and furthermore, makes no effort to exclude the
: profoundly blind.

All VE sessions I have attended included more than the minimum required 3
VE's. I don't think anyone has suggested that blind VE's should give
exams without the appropriate assistance. That is like expecting a deaf
ham to pass 1A-C with just the regular headset and not allowing for
alternate testing methods. The point is that with the assistance of a
reader and the other 2 VE's a blind amateur could easily discharge his
or her duties.

[Deleted part about the honor system like they have on 11 m]

: Sorry, but it doesn't work that way in real life. If the blind hams
: want someone to blame for their loss of privilage, I would suggest that

: they look at their fellow man rather than the FCC. The requirement for
: "observation" is a direct response to the lack of uniform ethics among
: people in general. This trend is unlikely to change anytime soon.
You got it half right. look to their fellow man who refuse to see and
accept what others who are different are capable of achieving.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: 2 Jun 93 13:03:22 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>There is little that blind people cannot do when aided by the proper
>equipment. For example, at one startup firm where I worked, the
>purchasing agent was completely blind, yet was able to conduct business

yeah, i would agree to a point, brian. but then again, i think you'd be able
to find people here that would swear the purchasing office IS blind from the
dumbo mistakes that they seem to be unable to prevent making. (yeah, the caps
are the wrong value and voltage and tolerance and dielectric and size and are
leaded instead of surface mount, but, hey, they were such a good buy - can't
you just waiver them this once? It's not like I can send them back, you know.
And it's a 20 year supply at current production rates! I bet a smart
engineer would be able to make those work and besides most things are
+/- 20% right? right?...)

in a fixed business you can install permanent features. we're
giving exams in an old classroom building (sorry, no wheelchair ramps in this
end of the building) and we count ourselves lucky to have a couple of duplex
power outlets to hook up the tape recorders and wireless headphone
transmitters.

there may be solutions that would let a sightless individual act as a
volunteer examiner with the same level of performance as a sighted VE, but i

doubt they'd want to lug the stuff down to the exam site once a month.

bill wb9ivr

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 19:36:21 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Dealing with zoning laws?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I recently got an approval recommendation from our local zoning board of appeals on my special use permit to put my VHF/UHF beams back up on my roof at a height of 20' which is 10' over the permitted limit. Unfortunately the ZBA's recommendation is only a recommendation to the Building, Planning, and Zoning commission. This commission is made up of the village trustees (elected bureaucrats). They also make a "recommendation" to the village board, i.e. themselves wearing different hats. In addition, I received a fair amount of flak from neighbors at the ZBA hearing about the usual things, appearance, interference, and EMF concerns.

Now my question to everyone is, should I try to rally the local amateur community by sending out a letter asking them to come and comment on their support of amateur radio antennas at the next Building, Planning, and Zoning commission meeting? Given the flak I received at the ZBA meeting, I'm guessing that with out some other significant support, my petition will be turned down since these are elected officials and my one vote is insignificant compared to the votes of my neighbors.

By the way, if you ever want to find out how "friendly" a neighborhood you are in, propose putting up an antenna system. But be prepared to put on your asbestos underwear since they flame more than the flamers in this news group flame. In the 9 months the antennas were up last year, I only received one complaint. There were at least 15 people that were drummed up out of the wood work to "testify" against me.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Wed, 02 Jun 93 17:22:14 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!
dana@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Important!: Field Day Packet Contacts can be disqualified!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I spoke to Warren Stankiewicz of the ARRL regarding packet operation at Field Day. He confirmed my belief that the "free" Packet station may use repeaters, either digipeaters or net/rom, and that the Packet station may operate on any band pursuant to the rest of the Field Day rules (i.e. 15 minute rule, etc.).

However, Warren warned me about two things that may not be obvious regarding packet operation for Field Day.

Warren said that packet contacts which use non-amateur means of communication, specifically Internet, are not qualified for Field Day points.

I asked Warren "What if you don't know that the Internet is being used?". He said "If we find out, those points will be disqualified". I did not specifically ask about wormholes such as the Simi Valley-CAPRA link, but I assume these are the same, they are non-amateur landline networks, which is what the term "Internet" generally describes.

My concern is that net/rom routes can be "opaque"; i.e., you may not know what kind of technology is used to link the nodes, and may inadvertently make illegal Field Day QSOs. In fact, this significantly reduces my enthusiasm to use digipeaters or net/rom during Field Day, since virtually every contact there might be disqualified later. At the same time, it gives me an incentive to protest Field Day groups showing large packet totals, given the likelihood of the use of non-amateur services. This is not meant as an anal-retentive comment, just a conservative reading of the rules.

Another issue is that packet contacts, whether by a conventional station or by the Packet-only station, count as CW QSOs. Therefore, if you operate HF in your packet station, you need to make sure to dupe CW QSOs by any station with packet QSOs by any station. I.e., if you have a 20m CW station and he works KK6JQ on CW, and your Packet station works KK6JQ on 20m packet, you only get to count one of the QSOs.

In summary:

- * Packet QSOs may use digipeaters and net/rom, but must not use non-amateur services, regardless of whether you know or not.
- * Packet QSOs dupe against CW QSOs.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact "contest@arrl.org" or Warren Stankiewicz of the ARRL at (203) 666-1541.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 2 Jun 93 16:31:25 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Unsubscrib
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Please unsubscribe me from this list.

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 17:06:53 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May27.183808.29398@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<1993May27.211256.5467@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU>, <1uhjusINN5mr@golem.wcc.govt.nz>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: You could hear a pin drop in this group lately

In article <1uhjusINN5mr@golem.wcc.govt.nz> andrews_d@kosmos.wcc.govt.nz writes:
>
>>I'd like to hear what people have to say about the proposed change to 902
>>MHz. Do we use it? Do we need it? Do we care?
>
>Yes we do need to have bands where we can experiment and develop new
>techniques
>In New Zealand we have 922- 927 MHz & we use it for ATV and other
>similar uses .. Please dont let us lose more spectrum..

Indeed. This band has become important to me. I've got 19 surplus
power company 900 MHz data repeaters originally used to control
switchyards. We've successfully moved a couple of them into the
ham band (24 MHz split) and intend to use them as full duplex data
links around the metro area. These are rather high performance
units of recent manufacture, and we're very excited about the
possibilities that they open up to us.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #171
